

# COURTS IN GRAHAM COUNTY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PLAN 2014-2016 SUMMARY



## LOCAL INITIATIVES, DRIVERS, AND PRESSURES

- Improve videoconferencing breadth, capability, and alignment with state standards.
- Upgrade digital audio solution at Safford Municipal Court.
- Restore FARE functionality in AJACS.
- Continue to improve facilities security through video surveillance.

## CY 2011/12 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- Upgraded OnBase to Version 9.2 and installed Unity integration at Superior Court.
- Pima Justice Court implemented an online payment system accepting credit and debit cards.
- Implemented video surveillance systems in various courtrooms and public areas to improve physical security.
- Installed video surveillance to observe tutoring services in juvenile detention facility training room.
- Inaugurated comprehensive security program with policy and procedures, training, screening, surveillance and incident response in Graham County Superior Court by hiring part-time security personnel. (The facility has never had any security personnel or formalized security program.).
- Continued sharing field trainer with Greenlee County courts.

## Statewide Projects: Impacts, Concerns, and Participation Plans

<b>LJ CMS</b>	Recognize the need and advantages; will be mid- to late-cycle adopters.
<b>JOLTSaz</b>	Generally positive assessment; concern about functionality of the planned interface; will be a mid-cycle adopter.
<b>LJ EDMS</b>	Safford Justice pursuing standalone OnBase, rest of courts interested in disconnected scanning to support e-filing; will be late adopters.
<b>e-Filing/Std Forms</b>	Recognize importance of e-filing but need to improve business practices first; will be late adopters.
<b>Bench Auto Architecture</b>	Superior court willing to be early adopters; other courts mid-cycle adopters. Don't perform local development; Crystal Reports in containment status.

<b>TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS</b>					
<b>Project</b>	<b>Year/ Status</b>	<b>Project Detail Provided</b>			<b>Comments</b>
		<b>Full<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Skeletal<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Mention<sup>3</sup></b>	
<b>EDMS</b>	FY14		X		Justice Court Precinct #1; local JCEF
<b>Hardware/Software Solutions for Videoconferencing</b>	FY14		X		Superior Court, Pima Justice, Thatcher Muni with jail
<b>Upgrade Digital Audio</b>	FY14		X		JP#1; improve quality
<b>Re-implement FARE</b>	FY14		X		Superior Court/AOC
<b>Facility Video Surveillance</b>	FY15		X		Superior Court

Note 1:

An “X” in “Full” indicates that the court has provided full detailed information about the project according to the general parameters outlined in the Commission on Technology’s Project Management Methodology. Also, risk analysis, impact, project costs and funding information has been provided.

Note 2:

An “X” in “Skeletal” indicates that the court provided detail about the local project in the master projects listing spreadsheet. Complete information, usually risks, impact analysis, project costs and funding, was not provided.

Note 3:

An “X” in “Mention” indicates that the court mentioned this project in a summary or listed it in an initiative. It may have been a phrase or a full paragraph of description, but did not contain detailed project-oriented information. If these projects are related to pursuing standards or directions already adopted (e.g., OnBase EDMS implementation, Jury+ upgrade, digital audio in the courtroom), then any mention which includes appropriate funding information is sufficient.